

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein.

The claims in the application are claims 1 to 19, 21 and 22, all other claims having been cancelled. It is noted that claim 22 stands allowed.


Claims 1, 14, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Apparently, claim 18 should be added to this rejection as well. The Examiner objected to the definition of n as being variables in pointing out that R<sub>1</sub> is also hydrogen. Claim 14 was objected to as lacking antecedent basis and claim 18 was indicated as being ambiguous as well as claims 20 and 21.

Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection since the claims as amended are believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph. R<sub>1</sub> is now defined as being hydrogen or as being selected from a Markush group. Claim 14 is now dependent upon claim 18 so that it provides antecedent support for the azeotrope. Claim 18 has been clarified by indicating that a solvent for a benzyl alcohol derivative is added with the water or after the introduction of water. Claim 20 has been cancelled and claim

21 has been amended to define A as being aliphatic, cycloaliphatic, aryl, araliphatic or heterocyclic. Support for this terminology is found in the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3. Therefore, the amended claims are believed to comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

In view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly point out Applicants' patentable contribution and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683  
Attorney for Applicants  
Tel.# (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds  
Enclosures